



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

ANTHONY HALL,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:22-3604-MGL-PJG
	§	
	§	
TONYA MILES, <i>Assistant Project Manager</i> ;	§	
ARNOLD RAYMOND, <i>Administrator</i>	§	
<i>Manager</i> ; JEFF SIMMONS, <i>Area Manager</i> ;	§	
PALMETTO FOOD SERVICES	§	
EMPLOYEES’; FORT JACKSON, SOUTH	§	
CAROLINA,	§	
Defendants.	§	

---



---

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION,  
DISMISSING THIS CASE WITHOUT PREJUDICE  
AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS,  
AND DEEMING AS MOOT  
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

---



---

Plaintiff Anthony Hall (Hall) filed this civil rights against the above- named defendants.

The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting to the Court this case be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The Magistrate Judge further recommends that, if the Court adopts her suggestion that the case be dismissed, Hall’s motion for a preliminary injunction be deemed as moot. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on November 18, 2022, but Hall failed to file any objections to the Report. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court this case is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** and without issuance and service of process; and Hall’s motion for a preliminary injunction is **DEEMED AS MOOT**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 8th day of December, 2022, in Columbia, South Carolina.

/s/ Mary Geiger Lewis  
 MARY GEIGER LEWIS  
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.